



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

6. — *A History of Greece*. By GEORGE W. COX, M. A. Volumes I. and II. (to the close of the Peloponnesian War). London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1874.

MOST readers will be surprised at seeing another History of Greece announced while Grote's name stands high as ever, and Curtius's work is hardly yet digested; and to many the need of another presentation of this theme will not be apparent. It has been, as we gather from Mr. Cox's Preface, chiefly a feeling of dissatisfaction with Grote's treatment of the earlier periods which has induced the author to take up the pen, and he has chosen, instead of treating this portion in special essays, to rewrite the entire history, bringing it at the same time into a more compact form than Grote has done; it will be complete in four volumes, including the mediæval history. The main feature of the work, however, was to be and is the first portions, down to the end of the Persian wars; the history of these times Mr. Cox carefully distinguishes from the rest, laying great stress on the fact that it is traditional, not contemporary.

As might have been expected from the author of the "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," Mr. Cox has approached his subject from a mythological standpoint, just as Curtius from a realistic and archæological one. His aim is to apply to all traditions the touchstone of comparative mythology. Yet very little space is taken up in the present work with the dissection of early traditions. Indeed, the first chapters are remarkable for what they do not contain. Rejecting as he does much material as mythical, Mr. Cox, unlike Grote, does not think it part of the historian's task to take any notice of it whatever. The first book he entitles "The Growth of Hellas." A single short chapter, under the heading "Mythology and Tribal Legends," disposes of all that is in Grote's first volume. After a brief description of the country, and an account of the beginnings of Aryan and Hellenic civilization, he proceeds in a fourth chapter to an enumeration of the tribes of continental Greece at the beginning of the historical period; a fifth treats of Sparta and its early annals; a sixth, of the despots; a seventh, of early intellectual growth; an eighth, of the colonies; the remaining four being the history of Athens down to the Persian wars: all this in 240 pages.

Mr. Cox's attitude toward the early traditions is one of extreme scepticism. Where the stamp of the myth-maker is to be seen, he consigns the whole summarily to cloud-land. Mythological traditions are not, he says, history, "*nor quarries out of which we may dig his-*

tory." Here is precisely the point where Mr. Cox's views will meet with opposition, and where it is safe to predict that a battle will have to be fought between mythologists like Cox and archæologists like Curtius. Before the boundaries of history can be fixed it must be settled whether there be any means of extracting from fabulous traditions the grain of historical truth they may contain. A few words on this, offered in all diffidence. That historical fact *may* form part of any tradition, however strongly tinged with the mythical, is admitted by every one, even by Mr. Cox. (p. 29.) How floating straws of fable love to gather themselves round a nucleus of fact we may see exemplified in the legends which in the Middle Ages clustered round the persons of Theodoric and Attila. But to detect the presence of fact and separate it from the web of fable is, we are told, hopelessly impossible. Rather, let us say, it is impossible except so far as our search be guided and our results confirmed by other testimony. But assuredly every resource of archæology should be exhausted, all that language, customs, religion, can teach us, must be brought to bear on traditions before the search be pronounced hopeless. And often tradition and archæology may, we believe, be made to confirm and supplement one another, and if both independently point in the same direction, we shall not be amiss in assuming that we have truth before us.

What Mr. Cox thinks of the Trojan war we knew before: he considers it a pure sun-myth. And if Grote pronounced the attempt to discover historical elements in this legend utterly unprofitable, so much the more does Cox do so. And yet there are some curiously suggestive circumstances. First, the thorough localization of the story. The scene is no far-off Aea, whose very name is fabulous, but all the incidents cluster round a certain spot just on the borders of Hellenic territory. What is so likely to have fixed these legends to this particular spot as, I will not say the sack of a real Ilium, but real combats between aboriginal Dardanidæ and Achæan invaders? For if Tell is a myth, yet the long struggle of the cantons for freedom is a reality, and that it is which has caught and localized the legend. Now whom do we find in historic times in close proximity to the Troad but Aeolic Greeks, whose language alone betrays their near relationship to the early Peloponnesians, in other words, to the Achæans, — Aeolians too singularly isolated and out of place? And apart from all tradition it would be no bold guess that they did not gain a foothold there without a struggle. There is then ground for more than a suspicion that the Trojan legends contain just this much truth, that the Troad and the neighboring country was the scene

of an Achæan invasion in which the new-comers established themselves where we afterwards find them.* All this is perfectly compatible with the mythical origin of the story of the Iliad ; Achilles and Helen may have lived in song and story long before those conflicts occurred with which they were afterwards connected.

A discussion of these and similar views is justly expected from the historian in the present state of science, and we cannot but think it a serious omission of Mr. Cox's that he ignores all efforts that have been made to glean by these perfectly legitimate means some shreds of fact respecting early Hellenic history. If we find him making too short work of the Trojan myth, yet more indefensible is his way of dealing with the ethnological relations of the tribes and their traditions respecting themselves. Indeed, this is to us the least satisfactory part of the whole work. It is safe to say that if Mr. Cox were as good an antiquarian as he is a mythologist, these chapters would have been very different. Some of his ideas about tribal names contribute no little to the trouble. These ideas had been developed before in his *Mythology*, and are here repeated in much the same language. He finds that the names Argive, Lycian, Delian, Athenian, and others are significant, and betray their mythical origin, meaning "children of light," "sons of dawn," etc. ; hence he infers that these names are worthless as a basis of distinction. "Argives and Athenians, Ionians and Arkadians, may have regarded each other as aliens, but their names have all the same meaning" (*Mythol.*, Vol. I. p. 240), and therefore the names afford no ground of distinction when different, nor cogent reason for identification when alike, as in the northern and southern Achæans and Dorians. (*Hist.*, p. 60.) At least (though Mr. Cox's expressions are not always clear nor entirely consistent), this is what one gathers from the sum total of what is said. Indeed, the author talks in places as if it were the very adoption of these names that made and kept alive distinctions of tribe : "The keen rivalry and bitter feuds which sprung from the centrifugal tendencies of the Greeks were intensified by the multitude of names, which seemed to draw a line of marked distinction between the several branches of one and the same race. By their very names, Ionians, Arkadians, Argives, Delians, held themselves to be distinguished not

* Whether with Curtius we imagine this to have taken place after the Dorian inroad into the Peloponnesus or not, is not essential. There is no difficulty in supposing those colonies to have been the result of previous enterprise, and that, when the bands of discomfited Achæans went afterwards to the Asiatic coast under pressure of the Dorian conquerors, they went to settlements previously occupied by their own kinsmen.

only the one from the other, but more particularly from Dorians, Achæans, Lykians, or Phenicians, and here again these feuds and enmities were fed by mere names." (p. 38, and again p. 148.) Even if there be a grain of truth in these views, they certainly are carried too far. Whatever may have been the original meaning of these names, whatever their original application, that meaning was obscured long before the dawn of the historical period, and no longer felt by the Greeks. Ionian and Arcadian were as distinctly the names of different tribes as Suabian and Saxon, of tribes remotely identical, of course, but who had grown apart; the distinction is no result of the name, but the name was given, or at least fixed in its application, when the difference already existed. The gentile names of other people are of similar materials; but because Saxons were "sons of the Sword-god," Bructeri, "people of light," shall we give up these as distinctive appellations?

Along with these ideas about names, we can hardly be surprised to see a certain vagueness in ethnological notions, both respecting the Hellenes as a whole, and the individual tribes. Mr. Cox fails to give his readers any adequate conception of Hellenic unity, of an actual Grecian people with a national character, religion, and language, connected by a close bond of relationship and conscious of this bond. Though he does in one place speak of the Greeks as "separated by certain strongly marked features from the inhabitants of the countries round them," and admits that "before the dawn of contemporary history a feeling of kinship had sprung up," yet he seems to think this feeling ill-founded, and emphasizes continually the relations of Greeks to other Indo-Europeans as if there were, after all, no real distinction between Greeks and other people. The unsophisticated reader would, we fear, lay the book aside with some such impression as this: that the Grecian people were a fortuitous conglomeration of Aryan atoms which had been wandering about independent of one another in a sort of chaos ever since the dispersion, and finding themselves thrown together in the Grecian peninsula, had deluded themselves into the notion of a specially close relationship, and community of language and religion. Of course, Mr. Cox does not mean to convey this idea, but many of his expressions suggest it.

In the same way the account of the separate tribes is rather vague. Nowhere is any clear statement of what language alone, aside from all traditions and beliefs of the Greeks themselves, shows to be the fundamental divisions of the people, differences traceable too in religion, mental character, political and social institutions: first the dualism (so finely brought out by Curtius, and the key to Greek history),

the deep cleft between Ionians on the one hand and Dorians and Aeolians on the other ; then the distinction, less strongly marked but real, between Aeolians and Dorians. In the place of this we have at one time hints that all such distinctions were imaginary and existed only in name ; at another time speculations on the possible connection of the Locrians "with the Ligurians of the Gulf of Genoa and the Lloegry of Britain and Gaul." Upon the early movements and migrations of these tribes the author thinks it useless to speculate. "We cannot look to the mythical movements of Aeolians, Argives, or Herakleids as throwing light on the distribution of the Hellenic tribes in historical times." (p. 40.) And again (p. 60): "In this neutral or negative attitude we must look even upon those alleged connections of eastern with western, northern with southern Hellenes." Here again Mr. Cox's caution carries him too far, and he ignores evidence which a careful examination of the geographical distribution of the people in historical times furnishes. We scarcely need tradition to tell us that the Dorians came down from the north and invaded the Achæan Peloponnesus. It is hard to tell whether Mr. Cox believes in the Dorian invasion or not. After such expressions as the last-quoted, and his distinct rejection, in the chapter on myths, of the story of the Heraclidæ, we gather that he does not ; but in subsequent pages we find him to all appearances tacitly taking for granted that there was some invasion, after all. Nor is this the only instance in which he leaves us in perplexing uncertainty of his exact meaning.

What the author thinks of Curtius's Ionian theory it is impossible to infer ; he mentions it nowhere, and omits all account of the Asiatic Greeks until he comes to speak of the Persian wars. Toward the commonly received story of the colonization of those towns he is sceptically disposed, and probably considers all speculations on the subject fruitless.

Respecting the first book as a whole, we cannot withhold our judgment that it might have been better. Mr. Cox has done well in emphasizing the unsubstantial nature of traditions in themselves. But we regret that he does not perceive the weight of evidence to be drawn from other sources in supplying at least the outlines of the faded picture, and so has represented us as more ignorant of the mutual relations and early movements of the Greek tribes than we really are. For these outlines there is lacking direct historical evidence ; yet they rest on firmer foundations than some of the etymologies in which Mr. Cox puts implicit faith.

It is a real pleasure to pass from this to Mr. Cox's chapters on the

Persian wars. An introductory chapter on Herodotus is really admirable. A fairer and sounder estimate of the man we do not know where to find. Mr. Cox sees the germ of the luxuriant growth of personal details which sprung up around the facts of the Persian invasion in the ethical notions of the people, and their habit of recognizing direct supernatural agencies in every event. The great events which had passed before them shaped themselves into a great moral epic; the details were unconsciously moulded and amplified to meet these conceptions. How all this took place necessarily and spontaneously, without the smallest intention or consciousness of falsehood on anybody's part, he illustrates well. No one has insisted more strongly on the honesty of Herodotus. These features of Herodotus's work guide the author in his treatment of this period. He distrusts Herodotus chiefly when the ethical bearing of his tale is plainest. Numerous particulars of Xerxes's march — his hesitation, his blind obstinacy, the conversations recorded, the portents which occurred, the statistics of Xerxes's forces, the whole story of Demaratus — are among the things which betray themselves as inventions. It is very possible that the author's scepticism goes too far sometimes. We do not, for instance, share his great doubtfulness about the canal through Athos. The battle of Thermopylæ he has, we fear, handled too roughly; for, though we admit some of the flaws he points out in the existing account, we believe them to be more superficial than he thinks.

Noteworthy is the author's admiration for Themistocles, in whose treason he refuses to believe, regarding the story of his visit to Susa as a fiction. Pericles it would be impossible to place in a more favorable light than Mr. Cox does. His language almost savors of hero-worship. Pericles's career was cut short; but had he lived to carry through his policy to the end, he would, the author thinks, have guided the Athenian state triumphantly out of the trouble into which he certainly helped to bring it. The disastrous outcome of the war, the demoralization of the Athenian demos, Mr. Cox ascribes to the abandonment of Pericles's principles and policy. The fickleness, vanity, and culpable weakness of that demos in later years he does not palliate. Most of the second volume is taken up with the Peloponnesian war. Here there was less room for originality of treatment; but the narrative is given in a vivid style, which will leave the main features well impressed on the reader's mind.

The tone of the work is, throughout, modest and scholarly; and there is not the smallest attempt to underrate the merit of predecessors, whose works Mr. Cox disclaims, in his Preface, all intention of

superseding. Though it ought in no sense to supersede these, the new book is worthy the attention of scholars; and its moderate compass will recommend it to many general readers to whom the long array of Grote's volumes appears formidable.

7. — *Truths for To-day spoken in the Past Winter*. By DAVID SWING, Pastor Fourth Presbyterian Church. 12mo. pp. 325. Chicago: Jansen, McClurg, and Company. 1874.

THIS is a second edition, differing from the first in the addition of a new sermon on "A Reasonable Orthodoxy," preached in the course of the author's recent trial before the Chicago presbytery, and a declaration made by him before that body in reply to the charges of Professor Patton.

It is said that Dr. Hodge of Princeton once solemnly declared of the pious Barnes's work on the atonement, that "it did not contain truth enough to save the soul." But at Mr. Swing's trial Dr. Patterson asserted in an able speech that since the union of the Old and New Schools, each having voted that the other was "a sound and orthodox body," "a man may be a good Presbyterian in the reunited church who does not accept the doctrines of reprobation and election and limited atonement and inability and imputation according to the sterner interpretation of them that was given by Calvin and a large portion of the Presbyterian church." (*Chicago Times*, 19th May.) But having sown the winds of uncompromising doctrine and polity, the Old School still reaps an occasional whirlwind of young polemics. And we are glad to have issues as definite as can be made in these indefinite days of the church raised and settled as clearly as compromising majorities ever venture to settle anything. After all, however, the acquittal merely affirmed anew the determination of the New School in favor of what Mr. H. W. Beecher, in a characteristic sermon on the subject, called with approval "a certain elasticity of interpretation." The real battle within Presbyterianism is yet to be fought. There is an opportunity for the synod of Northern Illinois to open it next October. Although Mr. Swing withdraws, his friends are committed to his declaration that "the Presbyterian church permits its clergy to distinguish the church *actual* from the church *historic*." (p. 319.)

It certainly involves a change of atmosphere to pass from the Westminster Assembly's Catechism to these sermons. But it is